

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 INNOVATION VENTURES, LLC, et al.,

No. C 12-05523 WHA

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

**ORDER GRANTING
MOTION TO STRIKE**

13 PITTSBURG WHOLESALE GROCERS,
14 INC., et al.,

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 Defendants Pittsburg Wholesale Grocers, Inc. and Pacific Groservice, Inc. (“Pitco”) filed
18 a motion under Rule 12(f) to strike conspiracy allegations in plaintiffs’ second amended
19 complaint. No opposition on the merits was filed. A self-serving, conditional statement of non-
20 opposition was filed, but the statement did not address plaintiffs’ position on the motion were the
21 conditions not accepted. In particular, defendants stated that they did not oppose the motion to
22 strike on condition that “the Court’s order clarify that those words are stricken only insofar as
23 they refer to Pitco.” Subsequent to the filing of their conditional statement of non-opposition,
24 defendant United Custom Distribution, LLC, filed a motion for joinder in Pitco’s motion to
25 strike (Dkt. No. 178).


26 In light of the failure of the complaint on its face to support the allegations of conspiracy
27 therein, all conspiracy allegations in the second amended complaint shall be **STRICKEN**.
28 Plaintiffs’ suggestion that the conspiracy allegations should be preserved as to three defendants
because the complaint asserts “facts that allow the inference of conspiracy (i.e. unlawful

1 agreement)” is unpersuasive. Where, as here, the object of the conspiracy is fraudulent, the
2 allegations of conspiracy are subject to the heightened pleading requirements of Rule 9(b).
3 *Swartz v. KPMG LLP*, 476 F.3d 756, 765 (9th Cir. 2007). Even assuming the facts in the
4 paragraphs cited by plaintiffs permit an inference of conspiracy, they do not state with
5 particularity the circumstances constituting the conspiracy.

6 Plaintiffs’ observation that no other defendants have moved to strike does not affect the
7 calculus. A defendant’s standing to challenge the conspiracy allegations against other
8 defendants is irrelevant because Rule 12(f)(1) plainly contemplates that a Court may strike
9 pleadings “on its own” initiative.

10
11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12
13 Dated: February 7, 2013.

14 
15 _____
16 WILLIAM ALSUP
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28